

Serial No. 10/806,890

Docket No. P1639US01**REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of the present patent application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

In this Amendment claim 27 has been added, and no claims are canceled. As a result, claims 1-27 are now pending in the application. Support for the newly added claim can be found throughout the disclosure, for example, at pages 11-12 of the specification.

In the non-final Office Action of September 25, 2008, claims 1-26 are rejected under grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting in view of claims 1-23 of U.S. Patent 6,823,377. Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of the paper entitled "Leveraging LDAP to Implement RBAC on the Web" (Bartz). Claims 1-11 and 15-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of the Bartz paper further in view of published U.S. patent application 2002/0133412 (Oliver).

Non-Statutory Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1-26 are rejected under grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting in view of claims 1-23 of U.S. Patent 6,823,377. A non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection was previously made in the Office Action of September 21, 2007. The Terminal Disclaimer filed January 22, 2008 in response to the previous double patenting rejection is effective against the non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection now presently pending. Accordingly, withdrawal of the non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is earnestly requested.

Serial No. 10/806,890

Docket No. P1639US01

§103 Rejection in view of Oliver and/or Bartz

The §103 rejection of claims 12-14 in view of Bartz and the §103 rejection of claims 1-11 and 15-26 in view of Bartz and further in view of Oliver are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

As discussed in the Background section of the present patent application some resources require a user to register before access is granted. For example, some Internet resources or other computer resources require an unregistered user desiring to access to enter registration information such as name, credit card number or other billing information. Conventional methods of registering users for access to resources require that the user enter registration information each time the user registers for a different new resource. Such conventional methods of registration are cumbersome and inefficient. The various embodiments of the present invention involve universal registration for an information appliance network, thus overcoming the inefficiencies of conventional systems for registering with a resource provider or other such server.

The Office cites Bartz in the two pending §103 rejections. The Bartz paper deals with authentication and authorization for providing access *for a user who is already registered*. The Bartz system involves a system for granting access to a previously registered user. Bartz does not pertain to *registration* as does the claimed invention. The Bartz system merely confirms the identity of the previously registered user. As discussed in the present specification a user may

Serial No. 10/806,890

Docket No. P1639US01

enter registration information into a universal registration resource.”¹ Then, later, when attempting to access a resource, “if the resource requires registration, the registration interface [e.g., DBO] may supply the needed information.”² By contrast, the Bartz device uses the X.509 certificate of a *previously registered user* to authenticate that user for subsequent access during sessions following their registration. A user of the Bartz system has to already be registered with the system in order to gain access since Bartz only confirms the identity of a previously registered user. The Bartz device uses a X.509 certificate to authenticate the identity of a previously registered user. This is expressly stated in Bartz:

[T]he customer’s *authenticated identity*, as supported by the person’s X.509 certificate, is their distinguished name (DN) reference to the LDAP directory object which describes the customer.³

The Bartz device would not use the same X.509 certificate to register a user with two different providers because the X.509 certificate does not contain “user registration information” as recited in the claims. The X.509 certificate is used to verify the previously registered customer’s authenticated identity. Therefore Bartz does not teach or suggest a “plurality of resources, communicatively coupled to said digital information appliance and said universal register via a network, *requiring user registration*; and wherein, in response to using said registration implementation dynamic base object to provide *user registration information*, a user of said digital information appliance gains access to contents of any of said plurality of resources” (emphasis added), as recited in claim 12. Since the Bartz system handles identify

¹ Specification, paragraph [0029] sentence spanning pages 11-12.

² Specification, paragraph [0030].

³ Bartz, page 72, item no. 1.

Serial No. 10/806,890

Docket No. P1639US01

authentication information of previously registered users rather than *registration information*, the Bartz document does not teach or suggest the features of claim 12.

In regards to the rejection of claims 1-11 and 15-26 the Office Action notes that Bartz does not teach or suggest a second provider resource. This is because the Bartz system does not register users. The Bartz system merely authenticates the identity of previously registered users. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Bartz does not teach or suggest granting access to a *first* provider resource in response to providing *registration information* (as discussed above), in addition to lacking a second provider resource as acknowledged in the Office Action. To overcome the acknowledged deficiency of Bartz (no second provider resource) the Office relies upon the secondarily cited Oliver published patent application. However, Oliver suffers from a deficiency similar to Bartz. Namely, the Oliver system is concerned with *verifying* the identity of previously registered users—that is, members of the system—rather than providing user registration information for registering with a provider resource. Oliver explains that the system is merely providing verification information rather than registration information:

[A] verification means [is] adapted to allow each provider to determine if a particular client is a member of the system, verify that the client has authenticated at home provider, and determine this client's access and service privileges and criteria. [The system involves a] method for managing client accounts and controlling access to resources over data networks...⁴

Hence, it is clear from this passage that the Oliver system manages client accounts rather than providing user registration information.

⁴ Oliver, Abstract.

Serial No. 10/806,890

Docket No. P1639US01

The Bartz document and the Oliver document, either taken singly or in hypothetical combination, do not teach or suggest the features of the claimed invention. For example, the cited documents do not teach or suggest “requesting use of a first provider resource which requires said user registration information, wherein said first provider resource automatically retrieves said user registration information from said universal registration resource to enable said user to access said provider resource,” as per claim 1, or “requesting use of a second provider resource which requires said user registration information, wherein said second provider resource automatically retrieves said user registration information from said universal registration resource to enable said user to access said second provider resource,” as recited in claim 1. The other independent claims recite similar features which the Bartz / Oliver documents do not teach or suggest. For example, claims 8 recites “obtaining registration information for the first resource from a registration dynamic object” and “obtaining registration information for the second resource from the registration dynamic object.” Claim 15 recites features similar to claim 8. It is respectfully submitted that the Bartz / Oliver hypothetical combination does not teach or suggest the features of the claimed invention.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Bartz and Oliver, taken either singly or in hypothetical combination, do not teach or suggest the claimed features thus overcoming the pending §102 and §103 rejections. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is earnestly requested.

Dependent claim 27 has been added by this paper. Claim 27 stems from claim 1 and recites “wherein the providing of said user registration information to the universal registration resource takes place before both the requesting use of the first provider resource and the

Serial No. 10/806,890

Docket No. P1639US01

requesting use of a second provider resource.” Furthermore, claims 8, 12, and 15 have been amended with similar although not identical requirements. Support for these newly added requirements can be found throughout the disclosure, for example, at pages 11-12 of the specification. For example, in the embodiment of claim 27 the user registration information is provided to the universal registration resource in preparation to begin using the automatic registration process—before the user seeks access to any provider resources. Claims 8, 12, and 15 include similar requirements. It is respectfully submitted that the prior art does not disclose or suggest these features.

Deposit Account Authorization / Provisional Time Extension Petition

It is believed that no extension of time is required for this filing and the accompanying Fee Transmittal attends to all necessary fees. However, to the extent necessary, a provisional petition for an additional extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 50-0439 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Serial No. 10/806,890

Docket No. P1639US01

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. However, in the event there are any unresolved issues, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact applicant's representative by telephone so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

GATEWAY, INC.

By



Date:

DEC. 23, 2008

Jeffrey A. Proehl (Reg. No. 35,987)

Customer No. 24,333

610 Gateway Dr., Y-04

N. Sioux City, SD 57049

Telephone (605) 846-2042 ext. 26809 (Lori Boulware – pat. assist.)

Fax (605) 232-2612